

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE ARIZONA ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS TASK FORCE

**June 14, 2007
9:00 a.m., MST**

The Arizona English Language Learners (ELL) Task Force met in Room 1 of the Arizona Senate Building, 1700 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona. Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m. MST.

1. Call to Order

Present:

Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman

Mr. Jim DiCello

Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan

Ms. Johanna Haver

Ms. Eileen Klein

Ms. Karen Merritt

Dr. John Baracy

Ms. Anna Rosas

Absent:

Dr. Eugene Garcia

A quorum was present for the purpose of conducting business.

2. Approval of April 12, 2007 and April 26, 2007 Minutes of Task Force Meetings

Chairman Alan Maguire put the approval of the minutes on hold until the next Task Force meeting.

3. Presentation and Discussion of Research Supporting English Language Learner Model Components

Chairman Alan Maguire asked Mr. Kevin Clark to give a brief explanation of the ten-page document given to each Task Force member. Mr. Clark explained that the questions in the document in bold italics are questions about research that were raised by Task Force members. Underneath each question is a summary of studies found relating to the question. He explained that the document is not a literature review. He stated that he looked for empirical data and will continue to add items as they come up. Task Force members may find any source listed in the attached bibliography or Mr. Clark will obtain it as requested.

4. Discussion and Possible Action on DRAFT of Structured English Immersion Models Based on the June 7, 2007 Draft Version

Chairman Alan Maguire stated that the purpose of the Task Force meeting today was to work through the draft of the model distributed last week and the numbered amendments, dealing with each amendment section by section and then approving the whole document. He clarified that the action today was not the formal adoption of the model, but rather the authorization of submission of the model to agencies as required by law, A.R.S. § 15-756.01, which is required 30 days before formal adoption. He said that he expects during these 30 days the Task Force will receive comments from one or more of these individuals or organizations. The 30 days will also provide opportunity to take public testimony.

Mr. Maguire stated that there had been no amendments proposed for page 1, lines 4 through 11, (of the “Authority” section of the document, *Structured English Immersion Models of the English Language Task Force*), and he asked the Task Force members if there were any amendments that had not been previously suggested. There were none. Mr. Maguire asked for consent to accept that section and move on to the next section. Mr. Jim DiCello moved that the “Authority” section, lines 4 through 12, be approved. Ms. Margaret Garcia Dugan seconded the motion; the task force unanimously agreed.

Dr. Eugene Garcia had proposed an amendment with comment for line 12 that would read as follows:

The Task Force entered in a series of information gathering processes that included:

- A. Open hearings in which K-12 sector practitioners presented the variety of programs and practices that are presently ongoing in Arizona in service of ELL students.*
- B. Presentations by invited state and nationally recognized researchers on research guidance the Task Force should consider.*
- C. Updates by the Department of Education on measures, standards and teacher policies related to ELL students in Arizona.*
- D. Invited presentations from a program in California.*
- E. Specific analysis of state data regarding the present success and attributes of success in moving ELL students towards English proficiency.*

(There may be more that we want to add here to lay the background for our final recommendations—the field and those reviewing the models need to know how we proceeded. I will specifically recommend that we have a 30-60 day public posting and comment period once we have completed a draft models paper on which we can agree. We should hold meetings throughout the state to receive comments.)

The Task Force utilized consultants selected by the Arizona Department of Education to summarize and analyze the information received by the Task Force, to provide a more thorough review of research, and to assist directly in the development of the final products of the Task Force.

Mr. Maguire stated that this is good material but not necessarily for this part of the model. He stated that it could be incorporated as a supplementary document later. Dr. John Baracy said that it would be good for others to see what the Task Force has been doing. Mr. Maguire answered

that his thoughts were to develop a separate document to include more of what the Task Force has done. Dr. Baracy agreed. The other Task Force members agreed not to accept the amendment.

The next proposed amendment was from Mr. Maguire for page 1, line 17 in the next section in the document, "Definitions":

After the period insert "Sub-level scores for grouping purposes are Oral Language, Reading, and Writing."

There were no objections from Task Force members to the change.

Mr. Maguire said he appreciated approval from the Task Force members for the first changes on lines 17 and 18 in the "Chairman's Amendment" (Technical and Clarifying Changes) dated 6-12-07:

Page 1, line 17: After "composite" insert "performance level"; after the comma insert "which is a composite of all of the subtest scores,"; after "and" insert "also"; strike "domain" insert "subtest"; after the second "and" insert "total"

Line 18: After "writing" insert "(writing conventions and writing combined). The AZELLA also includes an oral language score, which combines listening and speaking subtest scores, and a comprehension score, which combines listening and reading subtest scores."

Mr. Maguire drafted one additional amendment the previous night as a result of reading the other Task Force member comments. His proposed change was that on page 1, after line 18, add a sentence to clarify what sub-level scores are and add a reference to the statute. There were no objections from Task Force members to the changes.

The next proposed amendment was from Dr. Baracy for page 1, line 19:

After "...the teaching of the English Language" add "skills of Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing" to students who are in the process of learning English.

Ms. Garcia Dugan commented that ELD goes beyond just listening, speaking, reading, and writing. She suggested just adding "skills." Dr. Baracy agreed. The other Task Force members agreed. The addition of the word "skills" was accepted.

For page 1, lines 22-23, the following were from the Chairman's Amendment:

Line 22: Strike "and listening" insert "- the sound system of a language"; strike "i.e., verb tense" insert "the internal structure and forms of words"

Line 23: Strike "construction"; strike "vocabulary" insert "lexicon (vocabulary)"; strike "pragmatics" insert "semantics"

Ms. Johanna Haver suggested an added change to avoid any confusion defining ELD: after *ELD* in line 21, change *is* to *emphasizes*. The Task Force members agreed to the changes.

For page 1, line 26 the following amendment was proposed by Ms. Garcia Dugan:

Strike the number "50" and insert "55"; strike the number "10" and insert "5"

The Task Force members agreed to the amendment.

For page 1, line 27, Dr. Baracy proposed striking “*derived from*” and inserting “*listed in.*” Mr. Maguire commented that *listed in* would imply subset. Ms. Karen Merritt stated that *derived from* is more accurate. Mr. Maguire said the preference was to stay with *derived from*. Dr. Baracy and the other Task Force members agreed. The change was not made.

For page 1, line 29, the following was proposed in the Chairman’s Amendment by Mr. Maguire:
Lines 28-29 insert “(SBE)” after the words “State Board of Education”
There were no objections from Task Force members to the amendment.

Mr. Maguire proposed the next amendment for page 1, line 32:
After “AZELLA” insert “, regardless of their tenure as English Language Learners”
The Task Force members agreed to the addition.

The next amendment was proposed with comment by Dr. Baracy for page 2, lines 1 through 3:
Strike lines 1-3 (If teachers are all SEI-trained, then omit this definition. If we keep this definition in conjunction with lines 13-16, we are creating classrooms where ELL students would be segregated from proficient English-speaking students for the entire academic day, thereby eliminating the opportunity for peer interaction of a social and academic nature.)

Dr. Baracy asked Mr. Maguire for clarification on the definition before his amendment was discussed. Mr. Maguire answered that Task Force model is the 4 hour SEI model. What happens during the rest of the day is beyond the responsibility of the Task Force. With that concept in mind, Mr. Maguire agreed lines 1 through 3 should be taken out. Mr. Maguire suggested also that the phrase, *is placed in an English language mainstream classroom and*, in line 11 on page 2, appearing right after the word *Proficient* on line 10 also be taken out. To help clarify the issue, Mr. Maguire suggested that in line 15 on page 2 the phrase *4 hours of daily* be inserted after *provide* and before *ELD instruction*. The Task Force agreed to these changes.

The following were from the Chairman’s Amendment for page 2:
Line 5: Insert “and/or enrollment form” after the word “survey”
Line 7: After “a” insert “PHLOTE”; strike “whose primary home”
Line 8: Strike “language is other than English (PHLOTE)”; strike “Arizona English Language Learners”
Line 9: Strike “Assessment (AZELLA)” insert “AZELLA”
Line 11: Strike “mainstream classroom” insert “Mainstream Classroom”
Line 15: Insert “by a Highly Qualified instructor.” after the word “instruction”
Line 18: Strike the words “non-native English Speakers” and insert the words “non-proficient English speakers as designated by the AZELLA.”

Mr. Maguire explained these proposed changes to be mostly “cleanup,” particularly when repeating definitions or acronyms already defined. Mr. Maguire proposed inserting a reference to the statute, A.R.S. § 15-756.01, on line 12, page 2. There were no objections to the amendments.

The next amendment, with comment, was proposed for line 21 by Dr. Garcia:

Add: “Highly Qualified Teacher for ELL Students” means a teacher that has the state credentials required by the state and necessary to achieve the goal of moving students to English proficiency in one-year, independent of the beginning proficiency status of the student at the school site.

(We will not make any difference unless we have the most well prepared teachers in the SEI classrooms—they are the most critical pieces of any model we propose. I have added text later to address this important issue.)

Following previous added section: “Home Language Assessments” means instruments with appropriate assessment properties of reliability and validity and assess the student’s knowledge in ways that assist the educational treatment of that student in the SEI classroom.

(The research is clear that such assessment can be very helpful in placement and instruction—this is not mandatory but allowable in our models—nothing in federal or Arizona law prohibits this potentially useful practice.)

Addressing the first change, Mr. Maguire pointed out that discussion of teacher qualifications appears in much greater detail on page 6, lines 8 through 27. He suggested deferring this point to when the Task Force gets to that section. Regarding the addition of the *Home Language Assessments* definition, Mr. Maguire stated that this language does not appear in the model so it is not really relevant to the model. Ms. Garcia Dugan added that she would like the definition not to be in the model because it is not presently funded by the Task Force. Referring to Dr. Garcia’s comment, “nothing in federal or Arizona law prohibits this potentially useful practice,” Mr. Maguire added that nothing in the model prohibits the practice either. Dr. Baracy asked Ms. Garcia Dugan to repeat her comment. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated that she would not want districts to misunderstand that they might tap into SEI funds for this. Dr. Baracy asked why it would not be funded. Ms. Garcia Dugan replied that it is not mandated in the law to test students in their native language; districts may do so, but it is not funded by SEI. The Task Force unanimously agreed not to accept the amendments for line 21, page 2.

The next proposed amendments were from Mr. Maguire for lines 23 and 30 on page 2, under “Structured English Immersion Model Components” to strike the words *and principles*. Mr. Maguire explained that this document only talks about policy. The Task Force did develop principles to help understand the law and the reason behind the law. They are important for the process and important for practitioners but the Task Force technically doesn’t use them. Mr. Maguire suggested therefore the reference be deleted. He added that Dr. Garcia had raised the same point.

Mr. DiCello suggested that before the Task Force go any further, a motion be made to accept the “Definitions” section. Mr. Maguire agreed. Mr. DiCello made a motion to accept the “Definitions” section, beginning on page 1, line 13 through line 20 on page 2. Ms. Garcia Dugan seconded the motion. The Task Force unanimously agreed to accept the “Definitions” section of the document, *Structured English Immersion Models of the English Language Learner Task Force*.

Mr. Maguire returned to lines 23 and 30 on page 2 in the “Structured English Immersion Model Components” section. He reiterated the changes were “clean up.” There were no objections to the changes.

The next proposed amendment was from Dr. Garcia for line 23 on page 2:

After word 9, edit/add to read: research based structures and, research based classroom practices.

Mr. Maguire commented that while the model as a whole is research-based, each individual component may not be because of the prescriptions in the law. Mr. Maguire suggested a more global reference rather than specific references to research based. Ms. Klein suggested placing *are research based and after All SEI models, before include three major.*

The Task Force members agreed to the changes proposed by Ms. Klein.

Mr. Maguire read Dr. Garcia’s proposed change for page 2, line 26:

After word 5, edit/add to read: of local variables that will enhance and ensure effectiveness and efficiency ,and, variables articulated in state law including

Mr. Maguire stated that since there is a direct quote of the statute in this line, adding language could cause some confusion. He suggested the change not be made. The Task Force members agreed.

Mr. Maguire pointed out that Dr. Garcia’s proposed change for line 30 was addressed earlier when changes for lines 23 and 30 were approved. Dr. Garcia had proposed, with comment, the following change:

Delete “principles” (These are all state policies derived for law—not principles of the Task Force. We did discuss some principles that would guide our models, but these are not them—I do think we should go back and include them here.)

The next amendments proposed were from the Chairman’s Amendment for lines 1 and 2 of page 3:

Line 1: Strike “In A.R.S. § 15-756.01” insert “Arizona law requires”; strike “is required for” insert “during”

Line 2: After the period insert “A.R.S. § 15-756.01. Arizona English language learners task force; research based models of structured English immersion for English language learners; budget requests; definitions”

There were no objections to the changes.

Line 4 of page 3 was also a Chairman Amendment:

Strike “D” insert “Arizona English language learners task force; research based models of structured English immersion for English language learners; budget requests; definitions”

There were no objections to the change.

The following amendment with comment was proposed by Dr. Garcia for line 9 on page 3:

After word 9, add: "Other supplemental services that can assist the effectiveness of the SEI Classrooms should also be considered, including before and after school assistance/tutoring, summer programming, teaching assistants, parental/family engagement, and cross grade tutorials." (Given the high goal aspirations of the law with regard to achieving proficiency in one year, the research suggests that these supplemental services can be very useful and may even be necessary.)

Mr. Maguire suggested this change not be made because he did not think by law the Task Force could do this. Ms. Merritt commented that this likely falls under Compensatory Instruction. The Task Force members agreed not to accept this amendment.

Dr. Baracy proposed adding the word *skills* on line 16 after the words *English language*. The Task Force members agreed.

The following change with comment was from Dr. Garcia's amendment for page 3, line 16:

After word 12, delete all text after word 12, and insert, "Instruction in the SEI Classroom is directly related to the adopted Arizona ELL Standards." (We should not try to define ELD here but directly indicate that instruction in the SEI classroom is derived from and driven by alignment to the adopted ELL standards.)

Mr. Maguire agreed with the comment but stated that the issue is more thoroughly discussed in later sections about time allocation. The other Task Force members agreed. The amendment was not accepted.

The following changes from the Chairman's Amendment were accepted by the Task Force members:

Line 18: Strike "and listening" insert "- the sound system of a language"

Line 19: Strike "i.e., verb tense construction" insert "the internal structure and forms of words"; strike "vocabulary" insert "lexicon (vocabulary)"; strike "pragmatics" insert "semantics"

Line 20: Strike "actually"

Line 21: Insert "English Language Acquisition (ELA)" after the words "ELD is foundational for"

Ms. Garcia Dugan proposed the next amendment:

Page 3, line 23, after the words "Reading and writing" insert ", aligned to the English Language Proficiency Standards"

The other Task Force members agreed.

Dr. Baracy said to drop his following proposed amendment for lines 23 and 24:

Strike this sentence: "Reading and writing are also considered content in SEI Classrooms".

The next change with comment was proposed by Ms. Merritt for lines 25 through 29. Dr. Baracy also had comments about lines 25 through 33. Dr. Baracy's comments were:

I agree that taking the AZELLA for entry into the SEI classroom is appropriate; however, exiting solely on the AZELLA is debatable by some practitioners and, as we learned from the Chino Valley District, they use multiple measures (i.e., state tests, teacher recommendation) in exiting students so they are set up for success and don't flounder. Gerald W. Bracey states that an important principle of data interpretation is that we should "not make important decisions about individuals or groups on the basis of a single test." Taking the AZELLA more than once a year would pose a hardship for districts with thousands of ELLs. This past year has been a difficult one working with Harcourt. This arrangement needs to be simplified by the ADE and Harcourt. I would not want to impose further testing on the students and teachers. Once a year should be sufficient to measure growth on the AZELLA. Instructional time is already compromised by assessments given in English. They should not be subjected to excessive additional testing over what is expected of native English speaking students. It is not necessary to test each student at the beginning of the school year as they are tested each spring.

Mr. Maguire suggested that Ms. Merritt's explanation of her amendment would speak to the issue Dr. Baracy was raising with his comments. Ms. Merritt's proposed changes and comments were as follows:

Strike the words, "English Language Learners shall take the AZELLA at least twice during each school year, once at the beginning of the year, or upon initial entry to school, for purposes of placement, and once at the end of school year for the purposes of measuring progress." and insert, "New ELLs, in the first year of education in an Arizona school, shall take the AZELLA at least twice during the first school year, once at the beginning of the year, or upon initial entry to school, and once at the end of the school year for purposes of measuring progress. Continuing ELLs shall be reassessed with the AZELLA once per year, at the end of each school year." Her accompanying comments were: Who will administer the AZELLA? Will funding be provided for para-professionals to complete this extremely time-consuming assessment process? With all of the requirements being placed on ELL teachers under the ELD/DSI model, we cannot reasonably expect ELL classroom teachers to also pick up the task of administering the AZELLA. The education of the students will suffer if teachers are called away from the task of teaching the Discrete Skills to administer the AZELLA.

Adding to her written comments, Ms. Merritt explained to the Task Force that the wording now has ELL students taking the AZELLA at the end of the year and at the beginning of the year. She said that she did not think this was the intention. She stated that a baseline score is needed for any student who enters Arizona for the first time, whether from another state or from another country. An entry score on the AZELLA is needed along with the end of the year score, then after that the student only needs to be assessed at the end of each continuing year. She said that more verbiage should be added to her suggestions given that the AZELLA can be administered twice, possibly three times, in a year, but the requirement should be as minimal as possible: a first time score and then the once a year score thereafter. Mr. Maguire suggested striking the wording beginning on line 26, from the second sentence all the way through line 29 ending with the word *progress*, inserting Ms. Merritt's wording, and leaving the subsequent sentences. Ms. Garcia Dugan asked for some clarification. Ms. Merritt stated that new incoming students would be tested regardless of the time of year, then reassessed in the Spring. If a student was new to the

state in April that may be the first assessment and it is conceivable that the student may not be reassessed until the following Spring. Ms. Garcia Dugan said that kindergarten and first grade students would be certain to receive pre- and post- tests. Ms. Merritt affirmed. Mr. Maguire added that the wording still leaves it open for students to be tested mid-year. The Task Force members agreed to the changes outlined by Mr. Maguire for lines 26 through 29 on page 3.

Mr. Maguire presented the next amendment, proposed by Dr. Garcia, for line 31:

Ongoing alternative performance-based assessments related to the ELL standards (and the AZELLA) should be utilized to guide instruction and to determine the opportunity to administer the AZELLA for purposes of exiting the SEI classroom.

Mr. Maguire stated that this was a good suggestion, but he had two suggestions to tighten up the language so the sentence would read: *ongoing discrete skills inventory performance based assessments related to the ELL proficiency standards and the AZELLA should be utilized to guide instruction and determine the opportunity to administer the AZELLA for purposes of exiting the SEI classroom.*

There were no objections to the changes.

Mr. Maguire suggested adding references to the state statutes A.R.S. § 15-759B and A.R.S. § 15-756.05A at the end of line 31. There were no objections.

Mr. Maguire presented the next Garcia proposed change and comment:

Page 3, line 32: Delete “composite” and include “sub-test and composite score analyses”

Page 3, line 34 through line 26, page 4: Needs to be re-written.

This section is very confusing and is a critical pragmatic part of the models and at present it seems too dictatorial and not respectful of the varying schooling environments in which these children exist. I would want to give schools and teachers more “flexibility” in grouping so as to maximize the English proficiency goal. Moreover, here is where we need to address the realities of this one-size-fits-all issue. What does this grouping really look like on the ground and what accommodations might be necessary but still conform to the legal requirements of forming SEI classrooms and grouping students by language level? We have not had a serious discussion of the empirical assessment of this grouping strategy—we could do this by looking at how some select number of schools would actually do these grouping proposals.

Mr. Maguire stated that the standard in the law is the composite score. For purposes of determination, the composite score on the AZELLA is the determination. Determination for services for a student who has a proficient composite score but has a non-proficient subtest score are outside this model. The Task Force did not accept this amendment.

The Chairman change for line 32, page 3, to insert *performance level* after *composite* was accepted.

Dr. Baracy proposed the next addition for line 36 to make the wording more precise:

“Both the proficiency levels and grade levels of the ELLs must be used in order to determine appropriate placement.”

Mr. Maguire stated that the suggestion was a good idea; however, since the prior sentence sets up an implicit priority, the insertion of the word *both* might confuse that priority. The language as is clearly states that priority. Dr. Baracy agreed. There was no objection to not making the change.

Next was a Chairman Amendment proposed for line 1 on page 4:

After “schools” insert “(generally those grades where students receive most of their academic instruction in a single class as a single group)”

There were no objections to the addition.

The following changes were accepted without objection:

From Dr. Baracy for lines 3 through 5 on page 4:

*by proficiency level within a grade, then **proficiency levels** may be banded together within a grade. If there are not enough ELLs by proficiency **level bands** within a grade, then ELLs from different grade levels may be combined into an SEI classroom.*

From the Chairman for line 2:

After the period insert “The AZELLA composite performance level score determines the overall proficiency level.”

From the Chairman for line 6:

Strike “discretely” insert “separately”

From Mr. Maguire for line 6:

After the period insert “Also note that regardless of SEI classroom configuration, kindergarten students shall be grouped separately from students in other grades.”

From Mr. Maguire for lines 7 and 29:

After the period insert “Also note that regardless of SEI classroom configuration, kindergarten students shall be grouped separately from students in other grades.”

From Dr. Baracy for lines 9 and 10:

*B. Overall Proficiency **Levels** Band within Grade*

*C. Overall Proficiency **Levels** Band within Grade Band*

Mr. Maguire explained that the proposed change by Dr. Baracy for line 12 was taken care of with the earlier insertion. Dr. Baracy had proposed with comment the following for line 12:

Suggested grade bands could be K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-10,11-12.

(Add some specific grade level bands combined with language proficiency levels [i.e., C = Grade 2 has 1 basic ELL student; Grade 3 has 3 ELL students, one who is PreEmergent, one Emergent and one Intermediate; Grade 4 has 6 ELL students, one PE and 4 Basic])

Dr. Baracy’s proposal for line 15 to insert the word *sublevel* after the word *proficiency* was accepted.

The following changes were accepted without objection:

From the Chairman, for line 18:

Strike "a" insert "an overall"

From Dr. Baracy, for line 26, item E:

*Proficiency Overall **Level** Band within Grade Band*

Dr. Baracy made recommendations with comment for class size for lines 30-31:

Add: The class size for Pre-emergent and Emergent is 15. Delete "the maximum is 23."

Add: The target class size for Basic and Intermediate is 20. Delete "the maximum is 28."

(The class size standards as described are no different than some mainstream classrooms. ELL class size should be smaller.)

Mr. Maguire asked Dr. Baracy to provide any further comments before discussion of this item. Dr. Baracy stated that from some of the testimony heard, if a difference is going to be made, he suggests those numbers. Mr. Maguire stated that Dr. Garcia's suggestions, although not the same, were similar in nature. Mr. Maguire stated that because of the grouping in relatively narrow bands of curriculum, teachers will have fairly homogenous classrooms. He said this mitigates to some extent the need for smaller class sizes. The model is doing three things to contribute to developing a more effective classroom: the narrow groupings and therefore a tighter curriculum, the extended time on task requirement, and the teacher training. He asked for other Task Force member comments.

Mr. DiCello stated that classes, at least in the urban setting, have been much lower than what are being staffed, and the need to lower class size has been taken into account, going to the levels that are here. Mr. DiCello said that he believed the present numbers to be the most cost efficient. Ms. Garcia Dugan agreed with Mr. Maguire that the tighter bands will help with those numbers. Ms. Merritt said that funding for instructional aides needs to be addressed. She questioned if there was anything in the model that prevents a district that wants to use instructional aides from using money from sources such as Title III. Mr. Maguire replied that the model deals with state law and state funding. There is nothing restrictive in the model regarding, for example, the use of other funding. Mr. Maguire asked Dr. Baracy if he would like to make a motion. Dr. Baracy said that before he made a motion, he would like to reiterate that if the goal is for students to reach proficiency, then an investment has to be made. He still recommended the class size of 15 for Emergent and Pre-Emergent students. Ms. Rosas stated that perhaps the change could be made from target and maximum size classes to no more than 20 for Emergent and Pre-Emergent and no more than 25 for Basic and Intermediate. Thus, a minimum isn't specified but a cap is given. Ms. Klein asked how the joint legislative budget committee would price this and what support Dr. Baracy sees for his numbers. Dr. Baracy stated that his numbers were based on research that indicates 15 is the number. Ms. Merritt asked that if the law specifies incremental costs and the state normally caps a classroom at 25, for example, would the ELL fund pick up the cost between the 15 and the 25? Mr. DiCello stated that it is not the state but districts that dictate class size based on policy, sometimes as part of bargaining agreements. Ms. Haver asked if class sizes for kindergarten through 2nd grade could be smaller. Ms. Rosas asked for the reasoning behind the ranges. Mr. Maguire replied that the numbers are used for calculation purposes. The maximum creates an implicit minimum. Thus, a new class would not be developed, for example, because of one new incoming student. Ms. Klein asked about the research for present class sizes. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated that from the survey data, class sizes were larger than what the model is

suggesting, most likely because ELL students were mixed into mainstream classrooms. With only ELL students in a classroom, class sizes should be more manageable. Ms. Klein asked from where the recommended class size numbers for the model came. Mr. Maguire explained that they came partly from discussion and Task Force conversation based on surveys and present class sizes. Mr. Baracy stated that his numbers came from research regarding class size. Ms. Klein stated that this conversation had come up in prior meetings in which Dr. Garcia pointed out that there is no research specifically about ELL class size. Ms. Merritt stated it did not make sense that an ELL class should be larger than what research recommended for mainstream classrooms. Ms. Klein stated that may be if other adjustments were not being made but there are offsetting factors. Mr. Maguire asked if it would help if they were to say that the targets should not exceed the targets for non-ELL classrooms. Dr. Baracy disagreed.

Mr. Maguire suggested that the first step be to add language at the end of the first sentence on line 29 to read, “provided that the class size shall not exceed the average class size for non-ELL students in the district.” Dr. Baracy interjected that he would like to make the motion on his amendment. Mr. Maguire stated that Dr. Baracy would like to make a motion to accept the amendment regarding class size of 15 for Pre-emergent and Emergent and 20 for Basic and Intermediate. Ms. Merritt seconded the motion. Mr. Maguire asked if there was any further discussion on the issue. In a roll-call vote the following Task Force members voted in favor of the amendment: Dr. Baracy, Ms. Haver, Ms. Merritt, and Ms. Rosas. The following Task Force members opposed the amendment: Mr. DiCello, Ms. Klein, Ms. Garcia Dugan, and Mr. Maguire. With 4 in favor and 4 opposed, the motion failed.

Mr. DiCello moved to add the language, “provided that the class size shall not exceed the average class size for non-ELL students in the district,” at the end of the first sentence on line 29. Ms. Garcia Dugan seconded the motion. Mr. Maguire asked if there was any further discussion. There was none. With a vote of 7 in favor and one opposed, the motion passed.

The next change was proposed by Dr. Baracy for line 33 to add the word *the* before *Middle Grades*. There were no objections.

Dr. Garcia had submitted a request to clarify the language in line 32. Mr. Maguire stated that some of the changes made earlier will help with that. Mr. Maguire had no suggestions regarding any further changes.

A change from the Chairman was proposed for line 36:

Insert “based on the class size standards” after the word “ELLs”

There were no objections to the change.

Dr. Baracy needed clarification on the phrase *district-level* on line 38. Mr. Maguire explained that the term *multiple-school level* defaulted to *district* during discussion at a past Task Force meeting about teachers who, because of low ELL populations, would teach at more than one school. Dr. Baracy agreed with the use of the term *district-level*.

The next change was from Ms. Merritt for line 40:

After the words “for ELD instruction.” insert “ Students at a charter school or single school district may be grouped into a single classroom for ELD instruction by an SEI-funded ELD teacher for three hours a day with a fourth hour of ELD Reading.”

Mr. Maguire suggested making the addition without the 3 hour and 1 hour distinction since there would be no need for it. Ms. Merritt agreed and asked if a stand alone school with two ELL students, for example, would be provided an SEI teacher by the state for those two ELL students. Mr. Maguire said it seemed so unless there was a better suggestion. Without objection Ms. Merritt’s wording was added without the reference to the time breakdown.

Ms. Garcia Dugan suggested the next change for line 4 of page 5:

Strike the words “based on” and insert the words “aligned to”

The change was accepted replacing Ms. Garcia Dugan’s phrase “aligned to” with “consistent with.” There were no objections to the change.

A change for line 8 came from the Chairman:

Strike “foci” insert “teaching and learning objectives”

There were no objections to the change.

Dr. Baracy proposed with comment an amendment also for line 8:

After “.....skill foci” insert “This includes ELLs who are in their second or third year of the SEI program.” (Although HB 2064 expects ELLs to normally exit the program after one year, this is not the reality for most ELLs as research has shown, so practitioners will ask about these 2nd, 3rd, etc. ELLs.)

Mr. Maguire stated that this was taken care of with earlier changes. Dr. Baracy agreed. No objections were made to moving on to the next proposed amendment.

Dr. Garcia’s amendment document included a comment regarding text beginning on line 6 of page 5 and ending with line 6 of page 6:

I cannot agree with the very one-size-fits-all character of the scheduling and time allocations. Keep in mind that children move developmentally in very different trajectories and programs/teachers need to respond to those trajectories. In our present model, a teacher that begins with a class of pre-emergent students may have by the end of three months a mix of pre-emergent, emergent and basic students, and by six months, have some of these same level students in addition to set of students that have moved to intermediate—I can also see that this same teacher may have “lost” the proficient students but has taken in new pre-emergent students who have arrived at the school. In this case she would no longer have anything close to the students that she began with in terms of levels of proficiency. Teachers beginning with another set of student levels may find themselves with a similar range of diversity of students to teach. Therefore I suggest that the minute distribution in this document be changed to indicate the range of time to be spent in each domain dependant on the students that exist in that SEI Classroom. We cannot shut the door on the ability of the teacher and the program to address this range of real possibilities. Our model would do a great disservice to the field and the students.

Presently, the model does not rise to the challenge of considering these complexities in teaching ELL students.

Mr. Maguire had no suggestions to make on Dr. Garcia's behalf. There were no objections to moving to the next item.

The next amendment from Dr. Baracy was for line 13 of page 5:

*The English **Language Development (ELD)** skills categories.....*

Mr. Maguire stated that there was no need for the change because of the earlier definition. Dr. Baracy agreed. There were no objections to not making the change.

Dr. Baracy proposed the next change for lines 17, 20, and 23:

15 minutes of pre-writing instruction (240 total minutes)

Ms. Merritt suggested keeping it the four hours because of differing class times. Dr. Baracy agreed. Mr. Maguire added that the law was rigid about the four hours. There were no objections to not making the addition.

Ms. Haver's proposed amendment was for lines 15 through 23:

Students at composite AZELLA levels Pre-emergent and Emergent receive four hours of instruction of ELD that are divided into the following specific areas: listening and speaking, 45-70 minutes; grammar, 45-70 minutes; reading, 45-70 minutes; and vocabulary development and pre-writing, 45-70 minutes.

Students at composite AZELLA level Basic receive four hours of instruction of ELD that are divided into the following specific areas: listening and speaking, 30-45 minutes; grammar; 45-70 minutes; reading, 45-70 minutes; vocabulary, 45-70 minutes; and writing, 30-45 minutes.

Students at composite AZELLA level Intermediate receive four hours of instruction of ELD that are divided into the following specific areas: listening and speaking, 30-45 minutes; grammar. 45-70 minutes; reading, 45-70 minutes; vocabulary, 45-70 minutes; and writing, 45-70 minutes."

Ms. Haver explained that the problem lies at the elementary level, where teachers are forced to take instruction and fit it to the time frame. She stated that it is more practical to do the opposite: adjust the time frame to the instruction while making sure all areas are covered. Ms. Merritt complimented the suggestion. Mr. Maguire stated that good teachers automatically make adjustments. More specificity is helpful to teachers not as confident or experienced. He said that in general teachers appreciate the guidance. He added that the Department of Education is certainly not going to be using stopwatches to monitor the time. Ms. Haver stated that if the time allocations are written, that is what is supposed to be, particularly for one inclined to follow rules. She stated that a time range is much easier for teachers to work with. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated that teachers must work within time frames most of the time and plan within those time frames. She stated that the more structure the better. She said she did not want to see teachers consistently going over and leaving out certain areas of instruction. Ms. Rosas stated that she also liked the structure outlined in the model and that the ranges proposed by Ms. Haver may be too wide, allowing for some subjects to be skipped. Ms. Haver stated that perhaps a note may be added to the language that time may be adjusted for instruction. Mr. Maguire replied that the

training teachers will receive should clarify the issue. He added that the training is a very important component. Ms. Haver stated that ultimately teachers will do what is best for students. Ms. Klein suggested writing in a reference to time variance, that no one topic exceeds by the recommended amount. Ms. Haver said she supported Ms. Klein's suggestion more than what she had originally proposed. Through further discussion, the Task Force agreed to make the following changes: to insert "provided that the amount of time allocation may vary by plus or minus 10 percent to accommodate classroom practices," and at the end of line 23 place the reference to the four hours that Dr. Baracy suggested. The Task Force agreed.

Mr. Maguire stated that the next change proposed by Dr. Baracy for line 28 was the same as suggested for line 13 and still not necessary in this place. There were no objections.

The need for a space between the words *daily* and *or* on line 32 was pointed out by both Dr. Baracy and the Chairman. There were no objections to making that change.

Dr. Baracy raised the question regarding the wording on lines 4 and 5 on page 6:

Doesn't this contradict Page 3, line 15-18, in which English language arts is listed as "other types of instruction {than ELD}"?

Mr. Maguire suggested striking out the reference to *English language arts* in line 17 on page 3 as a way to clarify. There was no objection to making this change.

Dr. Baracy stated that he needed to depart at this time and would support a move to submit the document, with the understanding that there would be opportunity for future input and a vote on the model's formal adoption. Mr. Maguire agreed and thanked Dr. Baracy for his time.

Ms. Merritt addressed Dr. Baracy's comment regarding graduation credit (line 7, page 6):

This section needs to address how ELLs will earn all their credits for graduation within four years. Will they get credits which universities will accept for these ELD classes? Will they count toward college entrance? Will HB2064 and the models be in conflict with federal equal educational opportunity laws? How will ELLs earn credits for all the other content areas of math, science, social studies, foreign language, elective classes, humanities, fine arts, etc. within four years? These are big questions for teachers in the field.

Ms. Merritt asked if students will still be able to graduate in four years. She asked if it were possible to consider awarding a one hour credit of language arts given the rigor of the four hour model. Ms. Garcia Dugan stated that each district decides what credit is offered. Some districts have offered foreign language credit since the ELD instruction is English as a second language. Mr. Maguire agreed that this is an important point. Ms. Merritt suggested providing some suggestions to schools to help them with students receiving credits toward graduation. She stated that there will be much doubling up on language arts credits for students to acquire the proper credits to graduate. Ms. Garcia Dugan agreed that students may be at a disadvantage; however, there are summer school and evening classes. She stated that, if necessary, there is nothing wrong with a student graduating in five years; there should not be a stigma attached to that.

The next amendment was proposed by Dr. Baracy to strike lines 13 through 16 and insert on line 13:

*have an English as a Second Language endorsement **OR** a Bilingual endorsement*

Dr. Garcia had proposed with comment a similar amendment for line 14:

Use the word “and” instead of “an”

(The quality of the teacher is key to the success of any educational model. We have no evidence regarding best practice that indicates that SEI endorsement is what is needed by a teacher, minimally, to achieve the goal of English proficiency in one year. We were told repeatedly by model programs and practitioners that “best practice” utilizes ESL or Bilingual credentialed staff, plus large doses of professional development. We need to be very clear that we want the best prepared individuals instructing our ELL students.)

Mr. Maguire stated that although Dr. Baracy and Dr. Garcia had different approaches, the intent is the same. Mr. Maguire stated that requiring teachers to have both certifications may reduce the amount of available teachers. He asked for feedback from the other Task Force members. Ms. Klein stated that she understands that the certifications help educators better teach ELL students, but questioned how much they prepared teachers to work within the context of the model. She stated that the focus should be on the professional development for this model. Mr. Maguire stated that Dr. Garcia makes this point later and that the training is about preparing teachers to work within the model. The Task Force agreed not to make any changes in lines 13 through 16.

The changes recommended in the Chairman’s Amendment to change *SBOE* to *SBE* in lines 13, 24, 25, and 26 had been made earlier.

The next amendment from Ms. Garcia Dugan was for Page 6, lines 22 and 23:

Strike the words “be English teachers.” and insert the words “Have Highly Qualified status.”

Ms. Merritt and Ms. Rosas asked about clarifying the difference between a highly qualified instructor and a highly qualified instructor specifically in English. Ms. Klein suggested helping this clarification by striking an earlier phrase on page 2, line 15: *by a highly qualified instructor*. Since that was in a section that had already been approved a motion was required. Ms. Klein made a formal motion that the change be made; Mr. DiCello seconded the motion. The other Task Force members voted unanimously to accept the change. In addition, the Task Force accepted the change for line 20 on page 6 to insert the phrase *in English* after the words *Highly Qualified* and strike the sentence beginning on line 22 and ending on line 23: *In order to teach in the SEI Classroom, they must be English teachers*.

Regarding the proposed amendment by Dr. Baracy for lines 23 through 26, the Task Force agreed they were going to be consistent with the language as discussed for lines 13 through 16.

The proposed amendment was as follows:

*Strike lines 23-26; after the word “teachers.” insert on line 23 “Additionally, they have an English as a Second Language endorsement **OR** a Bilingual endorsement”*

Mr. Maguire stated that he agreed with this next commentary by Dr. Garcia, that professional development is important. He accepted the concept but suggested discussion later. There was no objection to moving to the next item. Dr. Garcia's submission was:

Line 27, add: Professional Development

Professional development in the early stages of the implementation of the Arizona model is critical. Educational personnel may be asked to make significant programmatic and education changes, to develop new measure of assessment and ways to tie that assessment to instruction to achieve new goals. That professional development at the school and program level must be provided (a minimum of 30-50 hours). As the program progresses and new insight is gained, ongoing professional development at the program level is critical for success. Therefore, ongoing designated professional development must be provided (a minimum of 20-30 hours/year).

(The continued development of teacher expertise is a clear component of the programs that work—we heard it over and over again—we must include this in our models)

The next change from Dr. Garcia was proposed with comment for page 6, line 3:

Insert, after word 7: overwhelmingly in English as per Arizona statute. Students' native language may be used to clarify and assist in enhancing the goals of achieving English proficiency in one year.

(Research is very clear that appropriate use of native language student resources can assist ELL students achieve proficiency in English even in predominately English instructional circumstances.)

Ms. Klein asked if a cross reference to the state statute would work here. The Task Force agreed to insert on line 33 after the word *English* the phrase *as provided in A.R.S. § 15-751, Paragraph 5*. The following changes were also agreed on: strike the phrase on line 33, *using materials in English with*; capitalize the word *the*; strike the phrase *of teaching* after the word *objective*; and insert *in the SEI classroom is to teach*. Line 33 thus read: *All SEI classes shall be taught in English as provided in A.R.S. § 15-751, Paragraph 5. The objective in the SEI classroom is to teach on or*

Ms. Klein stated that on page 2 line 15 the word *purpose* is used. She questioned the need to have the objective on line 33 page 6. Mr. Maguire stated that the reference to Discrete Skills Inventory is not in the earlier definition. Ms. Klein agreed but questioned the placement of the sentence under the present subsection regarding language use. An agreement was made to create a new subsection titled "SEI Classroom Objective" and place the sentence beginning on line 33 with *The objective* and ending on line 35 under that subsection. The phrase *SEI Classroom Objective* was added on line 29 after the word *policies*. Further discussion regarding the SEI classroom definition on page 2 led Mr. Maguire suggest combining lines 15 and 16 on page 2 to read: *The propose of the classroom is to provide 4 hours of daily instruction, as described in the definition of "ELD" in this section, in the manner prescribed therein*. Since the change was in a section already approved by the Task Force, Mr. DiCello motioned that the change be accepted; Ms. Garcia Dugan seconded the motion; the change was accepted by a unanimous vote by the Task Force. There were no objections to the changes made on page 6 for line 29 and lines 33 through 35.

The next amendment proposed by Ms. Garcia Dugan was for page 7, lines 1 through 3:

Strike the words “approved by the Arizona Department of Education based on their alignment with the Discrete Skill Inventory appropriate for the English proficiency level(s) of students in the class.” and insert “aligned to the English Language Proficiency Standards. Each school principal shall sign an attestation that these materials are properly aligned. When conducting monitoring visits, the Arizona Department of Education will verify that materials are properly aligned.”

The following change was agreed on by the Task Force: *Class textbooks, materials, and assessments in an SEI classroom must be aligned to the English Language Proficiency Standards and the Discrete Skills Inventory. Each school district superintendent or charter operator shall sign an attestation that these materials are properly aligned, which will be verified by the Arizona Department of Education when conducting monitoring visits.*

It was also agreed on to strike the phrase *in-course* from line 36.

Dr. Baracy had the following questions and comments related to line 11 on page 7:

Is this training in addition to the current ADE requirement for the 60 hours of training for the FULL SEI endorsement for all teachers and administrators? Is this the same as the curricular framework recommended by ADE?

Districts are just beginning to make some headway on this requirement and the record-keeping both in the districts and at ADE is a current challenge. More emphasis needs to be placed on training teachers and administrators on the ELL standards and their correlation to the ADE Language Arts standards.

Training should focus on research-based best practices for ELLs, i.e., SIOP, SDAIE, brain research, BICS and CALP, comprehensible input, the Affective Filter, multiculturalism, diversity, etc.

Mr. Maguire stated that the issue would be discussed in more detail in the upcoming section and that this is what has been discussed with reference to the Discrete Skills Inventory and the Discrete Skills methodology. There were no comments or objections to moving to the next item.

The following amendment was proposed with comment by Dr. Baracy for line 13:

Strike all references to the term “Discrete Skills Inventory” and use the term “Arizona K-12 English Language Learner Proficiency Standards.” (The AZ State ELL Standards should be used to guide instruction and to measure progress in English Language Development.)

Mr. Maguire stated that he was not in favor of this change because the Discrete Skills Inventory is such a powerful tool to help teachers know what their curriculum should be and how their classes should progress. There were no objections to not making the change.

Ms. Merritt had the following comments related to lines 23 through 25 on page 7:

This needs to be developed. Some possible considerations might include: Who is providing the training: ADE or the LEAs? When will training be offered? At what point will it be required? Is there a cost? How many seat-hours are required? Who will pay for it? Will teachers receive a notation on their teaching certificate which cites

completion of DSI training? (Please apply the same questions to administrators completing Implementation Training).

Ms. Merritt questioned how general or specific the model needed to be regarding funding and requirements. Mr. Maguire agreed with the importance of this issue and stated that the line between the model and implementation of the model has been discussed and that the hours and content specifics were to be delegated to the Department of Education. He added that the Task Force should monitor and could put more specificity into the model or talk with the Department to see where they are going. If the Task Force were uncomfortable with the direction being taken, the Task Force could then take some action. Ms. Merritt wanted clarification about funding. Mr. Maguire stated that since the training is part of the model it is part of the cost.

Mr. Maguire stated that this was the end of the changes. He stated that Dr. Baracy had a comment at the end, which read as follows:

Incremental Costs-H.B. 2064, Section 15-756.01, I, states: "The Task Force shall establish a form for school districts and charter schools to determine the Structured English Immersion budget request amount notwithstanding any other law, the maximum amount of the budget request shall be the incremental costs offset by the following monies:....."

I am concerned that any model that we propose be ultimately moved forward without this form being developed.

Mr. Maguire stated that he had discussed with Dr. Baracy the development of forms while the model is in the 30 day review.

Mr. DiCello moved to accept the "Structured English Immersion Model Components" section, which begins on page 2, line 22 and ends on page 7, line 28. Ms. Garcia Dugan seconded the motion. The Task Force members voted unanimously to approve the section.

Mr. DiCello moved that the entire document, *Structured English Immersion Models of the English Language Learner Task Force*, be submitted to the agencies as required. Ms. Garcia Dugan seconded the motion. Mr. Maguire asked if there were any further comments. Ms. Merritt stated that she wanted to make certain practitioners understand that the funding for this model is separate from funding such as Title I and Title III. Mr. Maguire stated that is correct, that state controlled money remains separate from federal money. Ms. Merritt asked if there would be any guidance for schools regarding the implementation of the model for this school year. Mr. Maguire stated that training needs to be discussed before the implementation of the model is discussed. He said that training is the key to implementation. Ms. Rosas asked who has the final decision regarding the adoption of the model. Mr. Maguire replied that the Task Force does. Ms. Klein asked if an allowance could be made to let staff make non substantive changes so that the Task Force does not have to reconvene. Mr. Maguire agreed. The Task Force members voted unanimously for the document, *Structured English Immersion Models of the English Language Learner Task Force*, to be submitted.

5. Presentation and Discussion of Upcoming Task Force Activities

Mr. Maguire stated upcoming activities had been covered when discussing the reconvening after the 30 days.

6. Call to the Public

Mr. Maguire made a call to the public. The first to speak was Laura Monson from the Alhambra school district. Ms. Monson stated that her district is a K-8 district. Her first question was if a 7th/8th grade teacher's Language Arts specialization would be congruent with the Highly Qualified requirement. Her next question was about the logistics of the teacher training given the high number of ELL students in her district, 6400. Her last question was regarding the timeline of implementation for the model.

The next speaker was Suzan Deprez from Mesa. Ms. Deprez is the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction for Mesa Public Schools. She asked for clarification that there is only one model. She also offered the assistance of the Mesa Public School Research and Evaluation Department. Ms. Dupree questioned when and if the Discrete Skills Inventory might be available to review. She stated that to evaluate and provide informed feedback to the Task Force, it would be necessary to see the Discrete Skills Inventory. She had a question regarding the implementation of the model, pointing out that most districts' planning for next year was in March. Her last question was whose responsibility it is to cross reference Proposition 203 with the Task Force recommendations, specifically with reference to providing student services at the student's local school. Her question was whether the transportation of a student from his or her local school to another would be in violation of law.

The next speaker was Noemi Cortés from the Osborn school district. She stated that her district has only six schools and funding is a concern for them. To implement the model, her district's needs, including an additional 14 teachers, ELD materials, continued coaching and support, and 2 portables to alleviate overcrowding, would cost the district a minimum of \$860,000. She questioned whether the state would be willing to fund that. She stated that in summary, districts need time and funding to properly implement the model, and teachers will need time.

Next to speak was Heather Wilson from Phoenix Union High School District. She requested clarification on the relationship between the ELL standards and the language arts standards. She also asked if they would have access to Mr. Clark's research. She stated that the separating grammar from the other literacy components was going to be a hard sell for her teachers.

The last speaker was John Stollar from the Arizona Department of Education. He stated that it is his job to oversee the implementation of the model and he wanted to make certain that everyone understood the position of the Department of Education is to implement the model with reason. He said that he was an elementary school principal for 14 years and a high school principal for 14 years. He stated that the Department of Education is acting productively and proactively and is developing a training program building from the model components and from Task Force discussion. He stated again that they would implement with reason and with help from him and others who have spent time in the classroom.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:16 p.m.

Arizona ELL Task Force

Alan Maguire, Chairman
August 15, 2007